

Serial No. 10/055,333

- 7 -

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
NOV 09 2006**REMARKS**

Claims 1-30 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-30 are rejected.

Claims 1, 13 and 21 are amended herein.

Claims

All pending claims in the application have been rejected under either 35 USC §102(b) or 35 USC §103(a) as being anticipated or obvious in view of Havinis et al. (US 2003/0202521) and further in view of admitted prior art.

Although applicants respectfully disagree with certain characterizations made in the Office Action regarding the cited prior art reference, applicants have nonetheless determined to amend independent claims 1, 13 and 21 in a manner that clearly distinguishes over the prior art. Specifically, with regard to each of the independent claims, applicants have added the limitation "wherein for an internet telephony call to a mobile user, the unified location manager operates as an inbound proxy for a given domain and for PSTN calls to an internet telephony user, cellular numbers are used to denote internet telephony accounts."

Applicants submit that the cited prior art reference neither teaches nor suggests the limitations as claimed. With regard to the unified location manager operating as an inbound proxy for internet telephony calls to mobile users, applicants submit that the cited reference does not teach acting as an inbound proxy, but is at best perhaps acting as an outbound proxy as was described with regard to the prior art in applicants' specification at page 11, line 28 through page 12, line 28. As can be seen, in such a scenario, the UMM of the present invention, by acting as an inbound proxy, uses a location related temporary phone number in order to be able to reduce the gateway selection process to a regular fixed-wire case, thereby minimizing all appropriate legs of the corresponding call.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 09 2006

Serial No. 10/055,333

- 8 -

Additionally, with regard to PSTN calls to an internet telephony user, cellular numbers are used to denote internet telephony accounts. This feature enables minimization of the IP call leg in the given scenario as was not previously possible under prior art schemes. This limitation as claimed is also neither taught nor suggested by the cited prior art reference.

Based on the above remarks and the amendments to the claims, applicants submit that the claims have been shown to be allowable in view of the prior art and that the basis for any rejections has been overcome.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, allowance of all the claims presently in the application is respectfully requested, as is passage to issuance of the application. If the Examiner should feel that the application is not yet in a condition for allowance and that a telephone interview would be useful, he is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at 908 582-7584.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Matthew J. Hodulik
Reg. No. 36,164
Attorney for Applicant
(732) 949-9742

Lucent Technologies Inc.

Date: November 9, 2006